

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 095

FL 021 560

AUTHOR Lambert, Richard D.
TITLE History and Future of the HEA Title VI. NFLC Position Papers.
INSTITUTION Johns Hopkins Univ., Washington, DC. National Foreign Language Center.
PUB DATE Oct 91
NOTE 10p.; Paper presented at the Conference on the Reauthorization of Higher Education Act Title VI (Pittsburgh, PA, March 2, 1990).
AVAILABLE FROM NFLC, Johns Hopkins University, 1619 Massachusetts Ave., N.W., Washington, DC 20036.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Area Studies; Educational Change; Educational History; *Educational Legislation; Federal Legislation; Higher Education; *International Studies; *Policy Formation; *Public Policy; *Second Languages; Testing
IDENTIFIERS *Higher Education Act Title VI

ABSTRACT

The history of Title VI of the Higher Education Act, having to do with language education and area studies, is chronicled by an educator closely involved in development of the legislation. The review focuses on four themes that have received the most attention: debates, largely outside the field, on whether to continue federal funding for Title VI; the appropriate level of funding; a series of reform movements attempting to redirect or redefine the legislation's language and area studies mission; and attempts to supplement Title VI by adding non-area-oriented purposes and clienteles. The current relevance of these issues is also discussed. It is concluded that while the original goal of the act was to create a group of language and area studies specialists who were committed to teaching, this portion of the act has been changed over time to try to broaden the occupational goals of these graduates, balance the disciplines represented, spread further into the undergraduate level, serve clienteles outside those originally targeted, and adopt a particular form of language testing as a standard. Add-ons have also broadened coverage. However, the basic purposes and forms of Title VI are seen to have remained relatively stable since inception. (MSE)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED 365 095



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Maxwell

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HISTORY AND FUTURE OF HEA TITLE VI

Richard D. Lambert
National Foreign Language Center

October 1991

FL021560

About the Author

Richard D. Lambert is director of the National Foreign Language Center at The Johns Hopkins University in Washington, D.C., professor emeritus of Sociology and South Asian Regional Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, and editor of *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. He is author of *The Language and Area Studies Review*, *Points of Leverage: An Agenda for a National Foundation for International Studies*, *Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies*, and *The Transformation of an Indian Labor Market: The Case of Pune*, and edited, with Sarah Moore, *Foreign Language in the Workplace*. Dr. Lambert's most recent book, *International Studies and the Undergraduate*, is the result of a massive two-year survey of undergraduate international education in the United States, conducted for the American Council on Education.

About the Position Papers on Foreign Language Policy

This is the third in a new series of *Position Papers* published by the National Foreign Language Center.

The papers in this series address significant issues in foreign language policy. As the title of the series suggests, their purpose is to stimulate discussion both within and outside the foreign language field on strategies for future development. The views expressed in these papers are the responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the NFLC or of The Johns Hopkins University.

About the National Foreign Language Center

The National Foreign Language Center (NFLC) is dedicated to improving the foreign language competency of Americans. The NFLC emphasizes the formulation of public policy to make our language teaching systems responsive to national needs. Its primary tools in carrying out this objective are:

- **Surveys** - NFLC conducts surveys to collect previously unavailable information on issues concerning national strength and productivity in foreign language instruction, and our foreign language needs in the service of the economic, diplomatic, and security interests of the nation.
- **National Policy Planning Groups** - In order to address major foreign language policy issues, NFLC convenes national planning groups that bring together users of foreign language services and representatives of the language instructional delivery systems in formal education, the government, and the for-profit sector.
- **Research** - NFLC conducts research on innovative, primarily individual-oriented strategies of language learning to meet the nation's foreign language needs of the future.

In addition the NFLC maintains an Institute of Advanced Studies where individual scholars work on projects of their own choosing.

The results of these surveys, discussions, and research are made available through NFLC's publications, such as these *Position Papers*, and they form the basis of fresh policy recommendations addressed to national leaders and decision-makers.

NFLC was established in 1987 as part of The Johns Hopkins University with funding from four private foundations: The Exxon Education Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and the Pew Memorial Trusts.

This paper was presented at the conference on the reauthorization of Higher Education Act Title VI convened by the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges at the University of Pittsburgh on March 2, 1990.

History and Future of HEA Title VI

RICHARD D. LAMBERT
National Foreign Language Center

The organizers of this conference have made a major mistake in inviting me to range back over the history of the development of Higher Education Act (HEA) Title VI and to make recommendations for its future course. In doing so, it is difficult to avoid a highly personalized account because I have somehow been involved in almost every development in Title VI since its inception. Over the past three decades or so, I believe I have not only attended but addressed all but two of the many national conferences on Title VI.

On many of those occasions I presented to the field the results of a survey or a set of recommendations on the reshaping of Title VI. At a meeting in the late 1960s I reported on a major national survey of the general state of affairs in language and area studies I carried out under the aegis of the Social Science Research Council (SSRC). The report, Language and Area Studies Review, served as a guide for the redirection and expansion of Title VI and made a case for its continuation at a time when government interest was beginning to flag. On another occasion, at a meeting at Georgetown University, I was called on to speak as a rebuttal witness to counteract the damage threatened by some of the findings of two surveys by the Rand Corporation that were less than supportive of continuing Title VI. The same sequence of report writing and public discussion of changes in the act occurred after the Association of American Universities (AAU) sponsored report Beyond Growth: The Next Stage in Language and Area Studies was published. Some of the findings of that report were incorporated into the recommendations informing congressional reauthorization of Title VI, which were presented by an advisory board established by Congress to advise it and the secretary of education on the administration of Title VI. Those recommendations were discussed at a full-scale conference and in

three formal public hearings held in Washington, San Francisco, and Chicago. I shall discuss below the relevance of some of the recommendations of that advisory board report to the current recommendations for change in the reauthorization of Title VI.

My final appearance took place two years ago when the ill-fated Points of Leverage proposing the creation of a national foundation for international studies was discussed. And, because I served as the director of the South Asia Center at the University of Pennsylvania for fifteen years, I have a fair idea of the operation of Title VI from the recipient end. In addition, I was a charter member of the pickup team that used to pound the congressional hallways trying to save Title VI when various administrations were recommending its demise. I say all of this to indicate that I am a card-carrying member of your tribe and to remind you of the rich history of substantive debate about the appropriate content and direction of Title VI that is germane to your deliberations today.

I think I can be most helpful by sketching in very broad strokes the various incarnations of Title VI, with special attention to macro issues of focus and coverage, and by commenting on several issues of purpose and strategy that may face Title VI in the immediate future. I hope these will be pertinent to your discussion of reauthorization.

As I look back on the thirty-year history of Title VI, four general themes have received the bulk of public attention: (1) debates largely outside the field on whether to continue federal funding for Title VI at all; (2) a related question about the appropriate level of the funding; (3) a series of reform movements, attempting to redirect or redefine the language and area studies mission of Title VI; and (4) attempts to supplement

Title VI by adding non-area-oriented purposes and clienteles. All four of these themes are relevant today.

To Continue or Not?

First, the Hamlet question: to be or not to be? The basic argument for Title VI's growing out of the shock of Sputnik was and still is what I call a scarce manpower argument: our nation needs more people competent in the less commonly taught languages so that we can follow what is happening in other countries. The nation, it was argued, needed a core of language-competent watchers to guard against unpleasant surprises such as Sputnik, a kind of democratization of the intelligence function. In those days before Vietnam, people were not quite so hostile to the identification with the military dramatized by Title VI's inclusion in the National Defense Education Act. Please note my emphasis on the original focus on language in the act, not a surprising emphasis in view of the fact that representatives of the Modern Language Association (MLA) and the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) were a main force in getting the legislation through. In those days the language community was protective of the primacy of language in Title VI. In the middle of my SSRC study I received an urgent call from the Office of Education urging me to stop talking about area and language studies and always to refer to language and area studies because a letter from representatives of the language associations decried the implied change in priorities indicated by my innocent reordering of terms in the title.

Language competencies were always in the forefront of our public presentations. When we marched up the hill and testified before Congressman Daniel Flood's subcommittee, which provided the funding for Title VI, we always argued that without Title VI the nation would not have enough speakers of, say, Cambodian, or later, Farsi, to meet our national need, and we had a catalog of horror stories on what that incapacity had done to damage our national interest. We still use that basic argument for the core activities in the national resource centers and the attendant fellowship programs, although we now talk of economic competitiveness; the term defense has been dropped from the title.

Over the years, although students have been required to take language courses as a condition for holding fellowships, the area studies portion of Title VI became dominant, in part, perhaps, because the majority of the national resource center chairs were held by

area, not language, specialists. Indeed, the emphasis on area studies allowed the scope of the national resource centers and fellowships to be broadened to include Latin American studies (1960) and West European studies (1973), neither of which was initially included.

This basic argument, the need for language competency, has been subject to several assaults, each of which has threatened the very existence of the program. Let me characterize them briefly because they are still part of the setting for many public discussions of Title VI. One constant danger to the continuation of Title VI is that it is what the federal government calls a categorical program, one that provides funds for narrowly targeted purposes rather than broad formulaic funding for such things as student aid. The administration and Congress have always been unhappy with categorical programs, particularly ones like Title VI that last a long time and have neither a need-based nor a geographic distribution as part of their grant criteria. There are now some seventeen categorical programs in the HEA, most of them for considerably less money than Title VI, and all such programs are always in danger of disappearing.

What Level of Funding?

In addition to administrative unhappiness with long-term categorical programs in general, another argument against Title VI has been that its support of campus programs is marginal at best. The figure usually cited is that Title VI funds meet only 10 percent of the annual costs of a typical center. Many government agencies — the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) among them — believed that Title VI could be discontinued without much loss; the universities would pick up the costs in any event. Over the past several years this claim has been made somewhat less frequently. A further argument is that the very success of the program has overcome the scarcity that gave rise to it, and therefore that continued federal support is unnecessary. This argument, the basis of a General Accounting Office report on Title VI issued some years ago that reached no firm conclusion, is also reflected in a very recent review of the operation of the act by Wayne Riddle of the Congressional Research Service. His argument is that the centers continue to have an important function, but the funding of Foreign Language and Area Studies (FLAS) fellowships is outdated. I can think of nothing more damaging to the field in the short run than the withdrawal of fellowships.

An equally threatening argument emerged from two Rand Corporation reviews of the field, particularly the second, which surveyed what FLAS fellowship holders did with their language and area training after graduation. According to the evidence in that report, too many of the beneficiaries of this expensive federally funded program were not really using the language and area studies skills they had acquired in their subsidized graduate training. The program directors argued that the Rand study was ill timed because it was conducted when the academic job market was fully saturated. Nonetheless, the fact that the funding survived this demonstration of low occupational demand was a tribute to the Title VI community's ability to rally to its support.

At times several of us have despaired of saving the entire enterprise. One of the most perilous was when President Richard Nixon tried to override congressional intent to provide funding, in spite of the administration's zero budget request, by sequestering the funds appropriated for Title VI, that is by not spending them even if they were appropriated by Congress. What saved the appropriation was that when Nixon tried the same strategy on veteran's appropriations, the courts invalidated the whole sequestering. Another low point in Title VI history came when the OMB, reacting in part to the recommendations of the Rand reports, directed the Office of Education not to seek any funding for Title VI. Some of my senior colleagues may remember the mad scrambles to create ad hoc lobbying forces to convince Congress not to follow the administration's homicidal intent.

In soliciting support to save Title VI from sudden death, we have had some strange allies and some quite unusual steps have been taken. One of the strangest occurred when Terrel Bell was secretary of education. The OMB had zero budgeted Title VI once again. To save it, the AAU convinced Caspar Weinberger, then secretary of defense, to write an unprecedented letter to Secretary Bell stressing the importance of Title VI while the OMB was directing the department not to seek funding for Title VI. The Department of Defense's intervention played a substantial role in convincing Congress to save our program's appropriation.

Many believe that Title VI has become so firmly established as a semi-entitlement program backed by a large, dispersed and politically active constituency that the demise of the whole program is unlikely. I do not share that sentiment. A great debate about the possibil-

ity of Title VI being folded into a possible national foundation for international studies has centered on whether Title VI is in chronic trouble and whether it would be helped or hindered by being grouped with other aspects of international studies. These efforts to save the program as a whole, although often desperate, have been episodic. More frequently the battle has been over the level of funding. In 1991 about \$40 million is appropriated for the domestic programs in Title VI and the appropriation for the Fulbright-Hays portion, which primarily provides overseas fellowships for faculty and graduate student is now at \$5.8 million. In 1980 the equivalent figures were \$17 million for domestic programs — less than half of the current figure — and \$3 million for Fulbright-Hays. The increases in both the domestic and overseas programs, however, have not been steady. Most frequently, Title VI has been level funded. Preventing a cut has often been a struggle, and, except in the past year or two, increases have not kept up with inflation. Moreover, the types and number of programs funded under Title VI have been expanded so that the funds available to individual grantees have actually shrunk. It is not surprising that the level of funding for Title VI has become almost an annual obsession with some center directors and their university development offices. Each spring when calling the president's office at the University of Pennsylvania for help in Washington, I was greeted with a groan on the other end of the phone and an anguished cry, "Oh, no, not again."

Efforts at Redefinition

In addition to threats to the continuation of Title VI and the struggle to maintain an adequate level of funding, two types of reformist activities were always taking place: tinkering with the basic structure of the language and area studies portion of the program, and adding new functions and clienteles. Let me start with the first.

The language and area studies portion of Title VI has undergone a series of reincarnations as it has been pushed to meet one or another presumed challenge to its existence. The first one I remember was an attempt to shift the emphasis from an exclusive concern with the production of advanced specialists to one of diffusion throughout other layers of the educational system and, outside of the educational system, to the public at large. The result was the requirement that each center devote an annual amount equivalent to at least 15 percent of its Title VI grant to what was called "outreach," which

meant dealing with secondary schools, others in the postsecondary education community, the media, and the general public. Outreach came more naturally to state institutions than to private ones, but it became a condition of the grant for all centers.

The attempt to expand Title VI vertically into other parts of the educational system would probably have gone even further if not for a fortuitous legislative accident. Some of us worked out a deal with the secondary school professionals to include them under the Title VI umbrella in return for their putting their weight behind our annual fund drives in Congress. We had, in fact, devised an elaborate "trigger mechanism" whereby their funding, to be provided under a separate portion of the act, would depend upon and come only after a healthy increase in the funding for traditional programs. We were saved from having to carry out this deal because Congress decided to separate legislatively all educational funding for higher and elementary-secondary education, thus moving the new section into the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Another attempt to reform language and area studies activities under the act came in response to repeated indications that the laissez-faire fellowship system had resulted in unemployment and a highly skewed disciplinary distribution among both faculty and graduates of the programs. There were lots of historians, literature specialists, and political scientists, but few economists, sociologists, or applied and professional specialists. To remedy this presumed maldistribution, the Department of Education established a set of priority disciplines for each world area and required the centers to redress this disciplinary imbalance in their fellowship allocations in an effort to head off the attacks on the program by training specialists who were presumably employable particularly in nonacademic fields.

A further attempt to reform the language and area studies portion of Title VI came in the redefinition of the distinction between graduate and undergraduate area programs. In earlier years, undergraduate center status was given to programs that were like the graduate programs but not so large or fully developed. Undergraduate centers thus constituted the lower end of a single continuum from large to small programs. Mid-sized centers used to hedge their bets by applying in both categories. Under pressure from some of the liberal arts colleges, the dual applications option stopped. Undergraduate centers, introduced in 1965, were dropped, then reintroduced in the late 1970s. Now institutions

decide whether to apply for undergraduate centers only or for comprehensive centers that combine undergraduate, graduate, and professional courses and students. The criteria for selection of centers were changed to make a clear difference between graduate-oriented and undergraduate-oriented centers. For instance, library collections were no longer rated on absolute size but on appropriateness for the particular teaching role. Moreover, an undergraduate-oriented seed money program was introduced in 1972 as a vehicle for experimenting with the early stages of programs that would receive only short-term support rather than support in perpetuity.

The most recent attempt to change the language and area studies section of the bill came as a response to a feeling that instruction in the less commonly taught languages needed to be modernized. The device selected was a requirement that centers adopt proficiency testing as a system of evaluating individual language performance. It was presumed that this would allow comparison of the effectiveness of teaching programs and the accomplishments of individual students. This strong preference for a particular form of testing was built into the last reauthorization of Title VI. It emerged most clearly in the legislative language relating to fellowships and in the Department of Education's guidelines, priorities, and instructions to selection panels. It came when the belief in the curative virtues of proficiency testing was at a peak. Some of the enthusiasm for this particular form of testing, indeed for the efficacy of testing more generally, has now diminished. On the positive side, this reform movement has spread the notion of program accountability for the results of language instruction. On the negative side, there have been strong reactions against the perception that a single and not fully applicable testing strategy had been prematurely given a governmental imprimatur. The result has been a concerted move to broaden the spectrum of acceptable strategies for testing language competencies in reauthorizing the legislation this time.

Efforts to Add Programs

The fourth major reformist drive has taken the form of adding to Title VI clienteles and programs having little to do with the original goals of the legislation, an attempt to incorporate more and more aspects of international studies under the Title VI umbrella. In part, the drive to incorporate some of these non-area-studies portions of international studies within Title VI resulted

from the fact that the proposed International Education Act of 1966, which would have covered many of these domains, was never funded. More recently, the same wide range of international studies interests was supposed to be included in a proposed national foundation for international studies. Indeed, in the absence of such an umbrella act or foundation, more and more international studies groups find ways to climb under the Title VI umbrella.

The first supplementary reform of this type was the 1973 addition of a category called international studies centers to the list of full-fledged, permanent centers. They comprised, in the main, non-area-focused ventures in international education, for instance, international relations centers, or thematic centers covering the whole world. As the rationale for Title VI shifted from defense to competitiveness, Title VI began to focus more and more on business. One example was the inclusion in 1985 of the international management program at the Lauder Institute of Management and International Studies at the Wharton School as one of the permanent international studies centers. More generally, a whole new section of the act, called Part B, Business and International Education Programs, was established in 1980. Its purpose was to seed innovative programs that applied international studies to business. At the same time that this program represented a deliberate shift from language and area studies, it also clearly broadened the former emphasis on research universities, where language and area studies programs most comfortably reside. In the selection of institutions to be supported in Part B, preference was shown for smaller institutions with a limited history of international studies. Very recently, Title VI has expanded further into business training. At the initiative of Congress, not the administration, at first five, now nineteen, centers of international business education were funded. In one of the many ironies of Title VI, these CIBERS, as they are called, are funded at a considerably higher level than the traditional language and area centers.

The durable political strength of Title VI lies in the fact that its clientele is widely dispersed throughout the country and its monies are largely distributed as discretionary general support. Over the years, while individual competitions change which centers are supported, most center directors have come to believe that the program will be funded into perpetuity. Title VI's basic unit is the center, which receives general support for itself and its students. One result of the center-based,

widely dispersed distributive nature of Title VI is that much less attention and support are given to programs supported under Title VI that are non-center oriented and that fund activities contributing to the national needs of the field. Indeed, when they seem to compete with center priorities, national programs have few champions. The fact that Title VI is a center-driven program has been both a source of strength and a major constraint on flexibility and growth. I strongly urge that in any discussion of reauthorization someone speak for those aspects of Title VI that support some of the necessary national superstructure.

I will mention briefly three such programs that are currently funded and three more that were written into the act but are as yet unfunded. The first is the Fulbright-Hays section, which provides fellowships for faculty and students to work abroad and supports a number of overseas advanced language centers providing upper-skill-level training for students as well as group projects abroad. Richard Thompson used to insist that any official or lobbying reference to Title VI include the Fulbright-Hays section as well for fear that Congress, in a fit of absent-mindedness, would not appropriate any money for it. This omission would have been a major blow for the field, but it has been difficult to marshal the kind of broadly dispersed popular support for Fulbright-Hays programs that center funding can muster. Similarly, while the National Endowment for the Humanities and the Fund for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education are providing specially targeted funding for foreign language research and development, the modestly funded research grant program and the Fulbright-Hays-supported faculty research abroad competition provide almost the only monies regularly available for research and development in the field as a whole. Their loss would be a major tragedy for international studies, but, as in the case of Fulbright-Hays, since it is everybody's business it often seems to be nobody's business.

Another Title VI-funded national level program supports a different kind of center, that is specifically dedicated to making a national contribution, not bounded by a particular university or consortium of universities. As indicated earlier, at the last reauthorization those within and especially those outside of the Title VI constituency were concerned that the nation needed to take major steps to enhance instruction in the less commonly taught languages. As a contribution to this process, the reauthorized act contained the provision that national

language resource centers should be created that would coordinate and help perform the needed research and development activities for the Title VI-relevant portion of the language field as a whole. In the first two years under the new authorization, no funds were appropriated for these centers. These were periods of constant budget level support for Title VI, and all concerned were reluctant to reduce support for existing programs to fund new ones. In 1990, through the special interest of the late Congressman Silvio Conte, the ranking Republican on the Appropriations Committee who became interested in the general advancement of instruction in the less commonly taught languages, Congress funded two such centers and a third was added with monies transferred in from the Department of Defense.

The process of selection of the new centers illustrates several of the changes that have taken place in Title VI more generally.

1. Since its origin in the aftermath of Sputnik, one of the primary rationales for Title VI has been to foster instruction in the less commonly taught languages. In spite of the clearly-stated intention of the appropriations committee, the coverage, both in languages eligible for support and in the appointment of the selection committee, was expanded to include Western European languages, and, indeed, second language acquisition more generally.

2. The Department of Education elected to model this program on the section of Title VI that supported individual research projects, rather than multi-purpose centers. This emphasized the value of individual projects to be initiated in the future rather than the past record of performance and overall strength of the centers. Although center applications undergo a peer review, the projects themselves are not subject to such a review.

3. The intention of the legislation to improve instruction in the less commonly taught languages more generally was narrowed to support of research and training for proficiency testing and the preparation of new teaching materials.

As a consequence of these implementation decisions, the choice of centers to be supported under this portion of the act startled and disturbed many in the original Title VI constituency. It dramatized the need to

attend to the administration of the act as well as wording of the enabling legislation.

In addition to these national level programs funded under Title VI, three others were written into the act but remain unfunded. I consider all of them possible major contributors to the national development of the field, but I fear that if they do not receive an appropriation in the next go-round, or if someone does not specifically urge their continued inclusion in the reauthorized act, they are likely to be swept out of the act.

The first is the so-called second-tier fellowship program. This program has no backers except the students. When our *Beyond Growth* site visit teams interviewed area studies students on each campus we visited, the students' greatest concern invariably was to find support for their advanced education, which was usually considerably longer in duration than that of their domestically oriented counterpart graduate students. Accordingly, we proposed that the reauthorized act include a new type of fellowship that would start after the satisfactory completion of the first two years, have some minimal specification of language competency, cover up to four years of expenses for work both domestically and abroad, and be awarded on the basis of a national competition.

We have been unable to get anyone to back this program even though the equivalent is in practice in several of the area studies groups, such as the Soviet and Middle Eastern fields. Indeed, the proposed program was modeled on the old Foreign Area Fellowship Program. The fellowship programs of the joint SSRC-ACLS committees serve this purpose now, although the joint committee fellowships have now been sharply curtailed. In this case an obvious national need has a difficult time making any headway because it sits in the superstructure of the field rather than in individual centers.

And finally, let me mention two other authorized but unfunded programs. Looking from the outside, one might think that an answer to the problem of widely dispersed demand and highly concentrated teaching resources for many of the less commonly taught languages would be language training in cooperative summer programs. In summer, truly intensive training can be given. Currently about 14 percent of FLAS funding is for summer language study, and some of the regular center funding is earmarked for summer language programs. A special provision for support of intensive summer language institutes, written into the act at the

time of the last reauthorization, remains unfunded. Similarly, the special needs of maintaining expensive library collections are not fully met as part of the general grants for centers. Especially costly and in danger of loss of coverage is the collection of up-to-date periodicals from around the world. Library support, and within it periodical acquisitions, has a way of finding itself at the bottom of the list of priorities when general funds are handed out. Funds are now authorized in Title VI for such free-standing summer programs and periodicals, but they have received no appropriation.

To summarize, the original goal of Title VI was to create a cadre of language and area specialists who were pledged to teach. Over the years, this portion of the act has been changed to try to broaden the occupational goals of graduates, to balance the disciplines represented, to spread further into the undergraduate level, to serve clienteles outside the centers, and to adapt a particular form of language testing as a standard. In addition to these changes in the core area studies program, a series of add-ons has broadened its coverage. These include the citizens' education and secondary school portions that were briefly funded under Title VI, then under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; the non-area-oriented international studies programs; and international studies centers and experimental programs. In addition, several programs serve the national superstructure. Three are funded: since 1962 the programs under Fulbright-Hays, since 1959 the research grant program, and now the Language Resource Centers Program. Three have not been funded: the second-tier fellowship programs, periodical acquisitions, and the intensive summer language institutes.

A look at the long history of Title VI shows clearly that the program has been immensely valuable to the field of language and area studies and to international studies more generally. As federal programs go it is extremely durable and remarkably stable. While it has periodically added new clienteles at the margin, the basic purposes and form of Title VI have not been fundamentally changed since its inception. Indicative of its stability is an experience at a center directors' meeting some years ago which was convened specifically to consider restructuring Title VI. The staff of the Department of Education had suggested that we be innovative and creative in considering a new format for Title VI; instead, we reinvented Title VI phrase by phrase.